

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Replacement sheets for Figs. 3 and 4 are provided to designate prior art drawings.

Attachment: 2 replacement sheets

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action. Reconsideration of the subject patent application in view of the present remarks is respectfully requested.

A copy of JP 60-157078 is provided as suggested by the Examiner.

Drawings

FIGS. 3 and 4 have been amended so that indication of prior art is clear.

Element 3a cannot be shown in the drawings as it is incorporated in the robot main body driving power cable 2a.

Specification

The abstract of the disclosure has been corrected to overcome the objection based on MPEP § 608.01(b).

The informalities objected to by the Examiner in the description have also been corrected.

Claim Objections

Claim 3 was objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Claim 2, upon which claim 3 depends, has been amended herein to correct and dependency issues.

35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicant's admitted prior art (paragraphs [0004]-[0011] and FIGS. 3 and 4 of the present application; hereinafter "AAPA") in view of JP 2003-285167 (hereinafter "Nishimura"), a translation of which was provided with the Office action. For at least the following reasons, the Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed.

There is no motivation to combine AAPA and Nishimura and, even if a motivation existed, the combination of the two would not result in the present invention. A significant

difference between the present invention and AAPA relates to how a feeder sensor cable 103b of AAPA is routed. There is no discussion regarding the routing of a feeder sensor cable in Nishimura. Nishimura discusses supplying a welding current to a welding tool through a ring 8 and a brush 9 without moving a power cable 3A connected to ring 8 and a power cable 3B connected to the brush 9. The ring 8 and the brush 9 are in slide contact so that the welding current can be supplied even when a frame 1 is turned with respect to a robot base 2. In other words, there is nothing in Nishimura that would motivate a person of ordinary skill in the art to alter the routing of a cable. Moreover, even if a person of ordinary skill in the art were to combine the two, the logical action to take would be to add a ring and a brush to a welding robot rather than anything else.

Further, in AAPA, a robot main body driving cable, a robot control cable, and a welding control cable were all connected between a robot main body and a robot controller. Claim 1 requires that a robot main body driving cable and a robot control cable are connected between a robot main body and a robot controller. Thus, the number of cables is less than that of AAPA. This realizes wire savings and improvement of workability and cost reduction. Further, there is nothing within AAPA that discloses, teaches, or suggests providing a power cable for driving a wire feeding device motor, a gas valve control cable, and a voltage feedback cable in a welding control cable and into a robot main body driving cable.

Additionally, Nishimura has a power feeding brush that is in contact with a power feeding ring in a sliding manner, and a power cable does not generate movement at a connection portion even if a swing frame swings, and a welding current is applied to a welding tool through the power feeding ring and the power feeding brush. This eliminates application of unnecessary load including giving slack to a power cable and twisting. However, Nishimura fails to recognize the issue of wire savings.

Nishimura fails to describe with any detail the power cable 3 for applying a welding current to a welding torch (paragraph [0022]) or 'a lot of control cables 4' (paragraph [0023]). Nishimura also fails to disclose a cable that corresponds to the robot main body driving cable and also the cable connection from an inside of a robot base to a power supply box. For at least these reasons, neither AAPA nor Nishimura fails to disclose teach or suggest a sensor cable of a wire

feeding device section, a gas valve control cable, and a voltage feedback cable provided into a robot main body driving cable.

Because neither AAPA nor Nishimura disclose, teach, or suggest each and every limitation set forth in the present claims, the combination of AAPA and Nishimura cannot render obvious such claims. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 39626.

Respectfully submitted,
PEARNE & GORDON, LLP

By: Una L. Lauricia
Una L. Lauricia – Reg. No. 48,998

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

Date: August 9, 2007